

REMARKS

Entry of this amendment is requested under 37 CFR 1.116 because it places the application in better condition for allowance or appeal by responding to each of the Examiner's non-art rejections, and the amendment presents no new issues. The claims as now presented are fully consistent with the construction given to the claims in the prior examination. For reasons provided below applicant believes the art rejections should be withdrawn and the application should be passed to issuance.

Claims 9, 17 and 23-25 are now pending. The applicant again thanks the Examiner for the detailed remarks and suggestions. The application has been amended in response thereto.

Based on the objections raised in the Final Office Action, one sheet of replacement drawings are transmitted herewith to properly label Figure 1 as prior art.

The Abstract is amended to correct an apparent error as suggested by the Examiner.

The dependency of claim 24 is amended per the Examiner's suggestion to overcome a claim objection.

With regard to rejections under Section 112, amendment to claim 9 overcomes the rejection of all claims based on the phrase "all data sources" by replacing the phrase with language consistent with the way the Examiner construed the intended feature. That is, "various data sources" and "multiple ones of the plurality of data sources" have substantially the same meaning. Applicant has also amended the dependent claims to reference the system as claimed in claim 9. Removal of the rejection under Section 112 is therefore requested.

Claims 9, 17 and 23-24 are rejected under Section 102 based on U.S. 5,966,695 (Melchione) while claim 25 is rejected under Section 103 based on Melchione in view of U.S. 2002/0188584 (Ghannam). Applicant requests reconsideration of that rejection and again contends that the claims are now properly directed to novel and non-obvious subject matter.

Claim 9 was rejected on the basis of finding a central database 10 in the Melchione reference. See Fig. 1 and col. 10. However, applicant urges that this disclosure of a data base is not consistent with the claimed subject matter. Rather, applicant's claim defines a requirement for providing "a uniform, central access to ... the ... data sources ... " while the prior art, at best, provides access to data stored in the data base. This distinction is consistent with the examiner's construction of the Melchione reference at page 7 of the office action where it is stated that Melchione discloses a system "configured to provide access to data from a plurality of data

Serial No. 10/535,036  
Atty. Doc. No. 2002P17467WOUS

devices ...” Clearly this is what Melchione discloses and clearly this is not what applicant claims.


For all of these reasons it is submitted that with entry of this amendment the application is in condition for allowance, and the amendment should be entered because it places the application in condition for allowance without presenting any new issues.

#### Conclusion

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees due in connection with this paper, including the fees specified in 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 (c), 1.17(a)(1) and 1.20(d), or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-2179.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 03/16/09

By:   
Ye Ren  
Registration No. 62,344  
(407) 736-6844

Siemens Corporation  
Intellectual Property Department  
170 Wood Avenue South  
Iselin, New Jersey 08830

Enclosure: One sheet of Replacement Drawings